

20th November 1963]

(c) whether the Government have taken action against the firm which supplied those medicines; and

(d) if so, the details thereof?

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM : (a) No.

(b) to (d) Do not arise.

MR. SPEAKER : Questions are over.

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—POINT OF ORDER

WALK-OUT BY SOME OPPOSITION MEMBERS AFTER SPEAKER'S RULING —*cont.*

MR. SPEAKER : Hon. Members are aware of the point of order raised by the Hon. Leader of the House yesterday. The point raised was whether the walk-out staged by some Opposition Members after the Speaker had given his ruling on an adjournment motion was not tantamount to showing disrespect to the Chair and set up a bad precedent. The ruling was reserved.

Walk-out has been recognised in India as a form of Parliamentary protest. Walk-out is of various kinds. Members may walk-out silently without making any statement. They may walk-out protesting against the attitude of the Government on a certain matter or against the ruling given by the Speaker. We are now concerned with the walk-out as a protest against the ruling of the Speaker. Speaker is the custodian of the privileges of the House and also represents the dignity of the House. When he gives a ruling it must be obeyed and it should not be protested. Even if the ruling of the Speaker is wrong, the Members should obey the ruling. If they are not pleased with the ruling, they can adopt other methods prescribed in the rules. No question of protest will, therefore, arise on the Speaker's ruling. A walk-out in protest against the Speaker's ruling is surely an unbecoming way of making a protest. In the present case the walk-out was staged immediately after the Speaker gave his ruling on the adjournment motion raised by Sri V. R. Nedunchezhiyan and three others. The Leader of the Opposition stated among other things that an opportunity to discuss the matter was denied and as a protest, he was walking out. As the Speaker did not give his consent there was no opportunity to discuss the matter. So, the protest could be construed only as a protest against the ruling of the Speaker.

But yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition stated that the protest was against the attitude of the Government and not aimed at the Speaker's ruling. I accept the clarification. I am also glad that Leaders of all parties have accepted that walk-outs against the Speaker's ruling are not in order and I hope and trust that

[Mr. Speaker] [20th November 1963]

this will be followed in future and a good precedent set up. After the explanation of the Leader of the Opposition, there is nothing left for me to give a ruling.

திரு. மீ. கலியாணசுந்தரம் : ஸ்பீக்கர்ஸ் ரூலிங்கை 'அப்ரி வியேட்' பண்ணலாமா, பண்ணக்கூடாதா?

கனம் சபாநாயகர் : சும்மாயிருந்தால் போதும்.

III.—CALLING ATTENTION TO ARREARS OF LAND REVENUE IN THE SIVAGANGA ZAMIN AREA

* **திரு. செ. மாதவன் :** கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே, இராமநாதபுரம் மாவட்டம் சிவகங்கை ஜமீன் பிராந்தியத்தை அரசாங்கம் எடுத்துக் கொண்டு அதற்குப் பின் செட்டில்மெண்டு செய்து நிலத்தின் தரத்தை நிர்ணயித்த காலம் வரை இந்த இடையிட்ட பசவிகளில் விவசாயிகளிடமிருந்து உயர்தர ரயத்துவாரி வரி விகிதத்தில் விதித்ததினால் வரிபாக்கி அதிகமாகச் சேர்ந்துக்கொண்டு வந்தது. செட்டில்மெண்டுபடி நிலவரி குறைந்துவிட்டது. அதிகபட்சம் வரி போட்டதில் ஏற்பட்ட பாக்கிகளை விவசாயிகள் கொடுக்க முடியாமல் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்கள். இதை நிவர்த்திக்க செட்டில்மெண்டில் நிர்ணயிக்கப்பட்ட நிலவரியையே அரசாங்கம் அந்த கிராமங்களை எடுத்துக்கொண்ட தேதியிலிருந்து கிராம மக்களிடம் வசூலிக்க ஏற்பாடு செய்ய வேண்டும் என்னும் அவசரப் பொது முக்கியத்துவம் வாய்ந்த விஷயத்தை கனம் பொதுப்பணித்துறை அமைச்சர் அவர்களின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவருகிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH : Mr. Speaker, Sir, before 1947, the rates of rent prevailing in estate areas in the Madras State were abnormally high when compared to the rates of assessment prevailing in the adjoining ryotwari areas. As a preliminary measure to the abolition of the Zamindari system, the Government decided to scale down the high rates of rent in the estate areas approximately to the level of those prevailing in the adjoining ryotwari areas. With a view to achieve this object on a rough and ready method, the Government enacted the Madras Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Act, 1947. Under this Act, the rents levied by the landholder were scaled down to bring them in line with the Government assessment collected in the adjoining ryotwari villages. The rates of reduced rent thus determined were not based on any detailed classification of soils and irrigation sources. In cases where rents were payable in grain, the reduced rent was also specified in terms of grain. But, where the commuted cash value of the reduced rate of grain rent exceeded the highest ryotwari assessment payable on lands of the same class in the district, the latter (i.e. the highest ryotwari rate of assessment of the district) was fixed as reduced rent payable. Subsequently, the Government considered that even this highest rate of assessment of the district was a hardship. They, therefore, decided that in such cases, the highest rate of assessment on ryotwari lands of the same description in the taluk in which the land in question was situated should